



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,413	10/16/2001	Otis F. Brown	9D-EC-19899/064853.031	6275
29391	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
BEUSSE BROWNLEE WOLTER MORA & MAIRE, P. A.			KRISCIUNAS, LINDA	
390 NORTH ORANGE AVENUE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 2500			PAPER NUMBER	
ORLANDO, FL 32801			3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/981,413	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BROWN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Linda Krisciunas	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/16/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gabbita et al (US 6,937,993).

As per claim 1 and 9, Gabbita teaches a computerized method for managing and communicating information regarding an order of goods among a group of teams responsible for performing tasks through designated personnel that, when successfully performed, allow for fulfilling an order within a requested delivery date (See Figure 1C, Figure 2 and column 3, lines 53-65. Figure 1C shows an order system (136) being computerized (138) and communicating to the LSP staff (139) and the construction group (144) who will install the goods and notifies the LSAT of its completion so that the order is monitored at all times for delivery completion as noted in column 2, lines 8-13) comprising: storing order data in a database (column 4, lines 51-52), the order data including at least one identifier (column 6, lines 34-42: where the LSAT coordinates and tracks the order which indicates that there is an identifying feature to the system) associating a respective order to a respective customer (column 6, line 28: work order), the order data includes a delivery date for the order (column 9, lines 23-28); gathering in

the database the progress of the order relative to the requested delivery date (column 16, lines 61-67: history file data: records the details of the activities and events that occur as the order moves through the system which allows for reports on order processing.); storing a set of rules that determines the potential cause of impeding the order progress relative to its delivery date (column 2, lines 37-39: monitors each work step and notifies pending work. The system in turn notifies the people as, column 2, lines 64-67 and column 3, lines 1-5 teach users log onto their stations and there is notice of work and who is responsible), the rules able to assign an order and/or corrective action (column 2, line 12: corrective action) to selected personnel in a team, based in part on the impeding order progress and (column 2, lines 38-39: notifies of pending work and column 2, lines 64-67 and column 3, lines 1-5 where users log onto their stations and there is notice of work and who is responsible); and processing the data relative to the rules for performing the assignment of the order and/or corrective action to the selected personnel in the event lack of progress is determined (column 2, line 30: workflow step and column 11, lines 6-7); and triggering a message to notify the personnel of the assignment of the order and/or corrective action (column 2, lines 38-39: notifies of pending work and column 2, lines 64-67 and column 3, lines 1-5 where users log onto their stations and there is notice of work and who is responsible).

As per claim 2 and 10, Gabbita teaches the message includes a link for accessing the database through an interface including detailed information regarding the status of the order (column 5, lines 18-21 and column 15, lines 26-27).

As per claim 3 and 11, Gabbita teaches the interface comprises a web page including a target date for performing the corrective action (column 2, lines 65-67 (120) and column 3, lines 1-8 where users can log on via an intranet or the like (which is equivalent to a web page) and receive progress data and who is responsible and determine information about the delay before it becomes critical. Therefore, the target date would be right before it becomes critical.).

As per claim 4 and 12, Gabbita teaches the web page includes a data field for recording actions taken by the personnel to remove the lack of order progress (column 11, lines 45-46 and column 18, lines 44-47).

As per claim 5 and 13, Gabbita teaches the web page includes a data field for recording comment data regarding the status of the order and/or actions taken to remove the lack of order progress (column 11, lines 34-35: history file).

As per claim 6 and 14, Gabbita teaches the rules are configured to assign a lack of progress severity rating based in part on continuing lack of progress beyond a fix completion date (column 9, lines 29-33 "status" and escalation (217)).

As per claim 7 and 15, Gabbita teaches the rules include a set of escalation rules for progressively assigning corrective actions to higher levels of supervisory personnel (column 18, lines 34-47: If Jeopardy points are not completed on time the item is placed in a Jeopardy state and will initiate a Jeopardy Escalation process whereby authorized users (deemed equivalent to supervisory personnel) reassign the work to another resource and the process repeats if the timing is not met.) based on a lack of progress

severity ratings assigned to a respective order (escalation (217) and column 10, lines 3-5: color coding as means for indicating severity/escalation).

As per claim 8 and 16, Gabbita teaches the teams are selected from the group of: order entry team (column 19, lines 55-56 (302) and lines 32-37 (310)), goods availability team (column 20, lines 26-27 (318)) and goods delivery team (column 22, line 43-44).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents also teach order management systems: Kovarik (US 6,014,628), Hanzek (US 6,654,726), and Smith (US 6,895,388).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linda Krisciunas whose telephone number is 571-272-6931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 6:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LMK

*LMK*  
*Nov 9, 2005*

*Susanna Diaz*  
SUSANNA M. DIAZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*AU 3623*